



Are You A Fascist?

The abusive use of the word "fascism"
calls for a new definition of it

BY AUSTIN J. APP, PH.D.

THE TERM "FASCISM" is a top favorite with communists, liberals, and Talmudists. After Francis Parker Yockey had disputed the justice of the Nuremberg war trials against the Germans and had written the book *Imperium*, which deplored the Rooseveltian betrayal of half of Germany and of Europe to Soviet-Russian barbarism, Stanley Jacobs, official of the San Francisco Anti-Defamation League, "publicly branded Yockey a 'top fascist' who was 'pro-Russian and anti-American' " (*Right*, Box 15065, Tampa, Fla., August, 1960).

At the beginning of the New Deal, on January 28, 1934, James Waterman Wise addressed the Free Synagogue in New York as follows:

"What we Jews must do is set our faces as flint against Fascism, against any form of it whatsoever. Our next step to be taken as soon as possible, must be to seize, in the interest of

the workers, all the nation's industries, and let nothing stand in the way, even should we have to use violence."

Perhaps the most startling abuse of the word "fascist" on record is the one C.L. Sulzberger reported from "London, February 1, 1947" in his *A Long Row of Candles* (Macmillan, 1969). He describes a "long talk with Chaim Weizmann, Zionist leader" during which Weizmann calls Ben Gurion "that damned fascist!"

That should suffice to show that a new look at fascism is called for! Communists, homegrown and foreign, bearded or yellow, hurl it as a top incentive at what they hate—which is anything conservative, Christian, anti-Communist.

Edward L. Delaney, in "TV Networks Aid Communist Aims" (*Truth Forum*, June, 1969) reported that on CBS's "Face the Nation," May 11, 1969,

Michael Klonsky, who heads Students for Democratic Society and is the son of a known communist, launched into the hackneyed charge that we are "facing fascism in this country." Delaney comments:

"Whenever that word 'fascism' and 'fascist' is injected into the discussions, we need probe no further for the source of the revolutionary gibberish that is spouted by the converts to communism. It is the communists' pet word."

In "Goldwater Upset Brings Cheer to Reds in U.S.," the *Tulsa Tribune* (November 7, 1964) commented:

"The Communist anti-Goldwater pamphlets and leaflets accused the Republican candidate of about every crime in the Reds' lexicon. 'A Front for Fascists,' 'Forerunner of American Fascism,' . . . to name a few of the communists' most often used invectives against the Arizona senator."

Obviously if one of our most respected senators is so denounced, something is awry with the concept of fascism.

A Soviet-Russian escapee, educated at the University of Moscow and imprisoned in Siberia, writes:

"Since last summer and fall, *Pravda* (chief Communist Party daily in Moscow), and *Izvestia* (official Soviet government newspaper) have continuously attacked Christian Crusade and Dr. Billy James Hargis. The Crusade has been called '**a fascist and racist organization**' and described as 'America's most reactionary organization' . . ."

Pastor Voronaeff comments: "We can only say, 'Praise the Lord, it means that the Crusade is starting to hurt the cause of communism.'" (Flyer, Christian Crusade, Tulsa).

Since 1933, it seems, there has always been a communist front labeled anti-fascistic. In "The American Liberation Front," Frank Capell (*Herald of Freedom*, August 8, 1969) cites two, "National Committees to Combat Fas-

cism," and "Youth Against War and Fascism." He writes, "The word 'fascism' has long been a Communist epithet applied to anything which is anti-communistic." He describes the "Revolutionary Conference for a United Front Against Fascism in America," held in Oakland, July 18-21, 1969. To it, William L. Patterson, national committee member of the Communist Party USA, away on a visit to Moscow, sent greetings bristling with the following phrases and sentences:

"reaction is seeking to create a police state and usher in an American brand of fascism"

"the black liberation movement" is to put "an end to the fascist drive of monopoly and to the mounting dangers of a Third World War"

"May your conference sow the seed for a monumental anti-fascist front . . . sound the knell of racism, for all fascist trends feed racism and are fed by it"

"The evil forces of fascism in the U.S. can be beaten by a unified people locked together in a monumental anti-fascist united front struggle."

The *People's World* (June 14, 1969) happily looked forward to this Oakland Conference and announced that the East was awake, too:

"In Edwards, Miss., . . . the board of the Southern Educational Fund observed, 'A repressive fascist-like society and police state is an ominous threatening possibility.'"

According to *Herald of Freedom* (August 8, 1969), the party organ, *Black Panther* for June 7, 1969, cites a long passage from Georgi Dimitroff's address at the seventh world congress of the Communist International (July 24-August 20, 1935), which would almost make the U.S. seem more fascistic than Mussolini's Italy. Choice phrases are: "Incipient American fascism," "reactionary fascist channels," "preventing fascism from winning over the broad discontented masses," and "the

success of fascism in the United States." This success Dimitroff explains as follows:

"In contradistinction to German fascism, which acts under anti-constitutional slogans, American fascism tries to portray itself as the custodian of the constitution and 'American democracy' . . ."

To prevent this, he recommends a "Workers' and Farmers' Party," which "of course, will be neither Socialist nor Communist. But it MUST be an anti-fascist party and must NOT be an anti-Communist party . . ."

This pointedly indicates that whatever other *isms* can be subverted to the ends of bolshevism, what apparently cannot be, what represents the quintessence of anti-communism, is fascism! In the *Daily World*, for example, one Margrit Pittmen, lauds the Black Panthers for striving to "embrace all progressive elements . . . unite all forces that are anti-fascist but not anti-communist."

Whenever communists are convulsed with anger against fellow communists they call them fascists. *U.S. News*, in "When it comes to name-calling the Chinese Reds are tops" (June 23, 1969) reports:

Peking's *People's Daily* calls the Soviet leadership 'the mad new Czars.' Says the official paper: These 'fascist renegades' have turned all Russia 'into a big prison.' They have 'tortured to death thousands upon thousands' of honest people. And the aim is to 'impose' war on Red China."

Here an accurate diagnosis of the crimes of Soviet-Russian bolshevism is incongruously labeled fascistic! A yellow kettle calling the Red one brown!

More customarily, of course the Communists and fellow-travellers call the United States fascistic, even though under Roosevelt it had "crusaded" against "fascism" to snatch for Moscow victory from defeat. According to *Time*

(Sept. 26, 1960), at a special session of the Mexican Congress (Sept. 14, 1960) at which foreign legislators were present as invited guests,

"Visiting members of the U.S. Congress sat in stunned disbelief as Deputy Emilio Sanchez Piedras compared the U.S. policies with those of Naziism and Fascism."

What an ironic turn, that the U.S., whose Rooseveltians in the Morgenthau Plan were dedicated not only to defeat, but to exterminate all German "fascists," should find itself denounced as similarly fascistic!

That certainly seems to be the rationale of the abuse of the word "fascism" by U.S. fellow-travelers and liberals. At San Francisco State College, a professor known to be unsympathetic to the strikers' cause received slashes on tires of his two automobiles and "Fascist scab" was painted on the cars' roofs.

When Prof. John Bunzel, chairman of the political science department ventured to criticize a Black studies program, a bomb was left outside his office and his classes were interrupted by screaming demonstrators who shouted "Fascist Pig Bunzel."

A traumatic shock for American liberals and interventionists was the war-time defection of the idol of the intelligentsia, Ezra Pound. Remaining in Italy during the war, he urged a negotiated peace, condemned Unconditional Surrender, and prophesized that the American crusade to destroy fascism could only result in a betrayal of most of Europe. He was arrested in 1945, flown to Washington for trial as a traitor, and found insane. He spent the next thirteen years at St. Elizabeth's insane asylum — until the war hysteria had abated.

Freedom for Everybody?

Pound's case furnishes a good illustration how the very liberals who most

demand freedom of speech for communists, atheists, and pornographers, shamelessly deny it to suspected "fascists" no matter how brilliant or literary. Eminent among such liberals, Bennett Cerf, president of Random House refused "to print anything by Pound on the ground that he was a fascist and a traitor." Coming from a Jewish publisher, such ideological discrimination should be shocking! According to the *N.Y. Times* (March 14, 1946):

"When Conrad Aiken, editor of the American section (of a poetry anthology) included twelve poems by Pound, Mr. Cerf ruled them out of the volume on grounds that a publisher has the privilege of refusing to issue under his imprint the works of proclaimed Fascists."

Happily, however, Aiken, who in World War I had been a virtual conscientious objector, protested so vehemently that Cerf was shamed into re-admitting Pound's poems.

Cerf's rejection of Ezra Pound ought to convince any open-minded person that the liberals, who are so hospitable to communists and radicals on the left, do not tolerate freedom of speech for "fascists," and that is anyone to the right of them, anyone they do not like, anyone who is actively anti-communistic. Hans F. Sennholz, in "America's Fascist Threat," writes:

"At one time or another most conservatives and libertarians have been called Fascists, although their principles of society, government, and economy are diametrically opposed to the tenets of Fascism." (*Review of the News*, June 28, 1967)

The late Drew Pearson, who would have sued anyone who called him a communist, unabashedly smear-terrorized conservatives as "fascists." In his column of August 4, 1964 (*Record News*, Wichita Falls) he reported:

"the President of Costa Rica,

while on a state visit to the King Ranch in Texas, was so shocked at Fascist conversation that a protest was made to the State Department."

Upon hearing of this, Gonzalo J. Facio, the Costa Rican Ambassador, wrote Mr. Richard M. Kleberg Jr., of the King Ranch, "We did not at any time hear such Fascist conversation or anything that could have offended our feelings" (Letter, August 6, 1964). Senator John G. Tower, in exposing this "Drew Pearson Smear," said Pearson went "to great length to smear the Kleberg family in Texas" so that by the process of guilt by association he could "point out that 'most of the Kleberg family were ardent Goldwaterites'" (See *Human Events*, Sept. 26, 1964).

While in degree, of course, Drew Pearson, was the most dishonorable of the liberal publicists, he was typical as to sympathies and viewpoint. Father Daniel Lyons, now editor of *Twin Circle*, wrote of Pearson two years before his belated demise:

"... he consistently attacks anti-Communists and... avoids smearing the Left. He strongly favored the Communists in Spain in the late 1930's. He has repeatedly adhered to the double standard of the Left: Communism is good, Fascism is bad; Tito is upstanding, Franco a tyrant... He called John Foster Dulles 'a Fascist.'" (*Our Sunday Visitor*, May 14, 1967)

If for this file-filching, smear-terroristic liberal. "Communism is good, Fascism is bad," it might seem wise to debate whether perhaps the reverse is not true! Francis Parker Yockey satirizes the liberal equation of fascism with evil as follows:

"A foreign development sought to be brought about is called 'spreading democracy'; a development sought to be hindered is 'against democracy,' or 'fascistic.' 'Fascism' is the numen corresponding to evil in theology, and in fact they are directly equated

in American propaganda." (*Imperium*, p.529)

The great revisionistic historian, a reformed liberal, the late Harry Elmer Barnes, satirized how the Rooseveltian court historians pervert what they do not like into "fascism":

"Bishop Bossuet, actually the great ideological apologist for paternalistic absolutism, becomes the first French fascist because his doctrines were the chief political inspiration of Marshal Petain. Proudhon, about whom historians long wrangled as to whether he is to be most accurately classified as an anarchist or as a socialist, is now revealed by J. Salwyn Shapiro to be the father of French fascism." (See *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*, Caxton, Caldwell, Idaho, 1953, p. 60)

He adds:

"Serious scholars have even sought to interpret Socrates, long supposed to have been the first martyr to the freedom of thought and expression, as the father of fascism. Plato, of late, has frequently been described as the outstanding Greek fascist."

If such revered giants of antiquity as Socrates and Plato can be called fascists, either the current definition of fascism is wrong or the critique of it. Surely, a new look at fascism seems to be called for!

Careful Who You Call a Communist!

Because communists, Talmudists, and liberals have made fascism the prize epithet of abuse, hurled recklessly at all anti-communists and active conservatives, it is not surprising that the latter sometimes turn the tables and hurl it back. They do this the more readily because, oddly, though to the liberals being a fascist is worse than being a wife-murderer but being a communist is an amiable failing with much virtue in it, they have pressured the courts to treat calling anyone a com-

munist libel, unless he can be proved to carry a Party card. And that no matter how like a communist he acts and talks and writes — and to how many notorious Red Fronts he belongs.

But calling anyone a fascist, no matter how unjustified, the courts still treat as a privileged criticism! This is true wherever the Rooseveltians could impose their Morgenthauistic "re-education." When recently in Berlin police officers took to court leftists who had called them fascists, the Judge felt obliged to rule that calling someone fascist was no insult or libel, because the term only signifies a political tendency, that however calling someone a communist is libellous unless he certainly carries a Party card! (See *Das Ostpreussenblatt*, June 28, 1969).

The Liberals Are Facists

Conservatives who turn the tables by calling liberals and leftists "fascists" base themselves on the long-dead Senator Huey Long's dictum: "If fascism comes to America, it will come disguised as anti-fascism." (Quoted from *Human Events*, Oct. 10, 1964). In that sense John T. Flynn, a courageous non-interventionist, in *As We Go Marching*, wrote Barnes, "revealed the fascist trends in our war policy." Barnes relates:

"A good example of the irresponsibility in smearing Flynn is the statement of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., in the *New York Post* to the effect that the Yalta conference will rebound to the honor of Franklin D. Roosevelt 'unless a Fascist revolution installs William Henry Chamberlin and John T. Flynn as official national historians.'"

John T. Flynn, in his pamphlet "The Smear Terror" (1947), most terrifyingly described how the anti-anti-Communists employ the term "fascism" to smear-terrorize whom they do not like:

(Continued on Page 57)

Are You A Fascist?

(Continued from Page 23)

"In this profession certain words are important. If you attack Communists, you are called pro-fascist. If you are pro-fascist, you are anti-Semitic, because Hitler was anti-semitic. Thus by the simple device of proving that you are anti-Communist you can be shown to be a fascist, a pro-Nazi, an anti-semitic and a subversive person. Going one more step, if you are seen with such a 'pro-fascist' or 'anti-Semitic,' if you answer his letter, attend the same meeting with him, then you are also branded as pro-fascist, pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic" (p.4).

This is such an accurate description of the technique of smear-terrorism employed by the likes of Drew Pearson, Walter Winchell, Leon M. Birkhead, the Society for the Prevention of World War III, and the Anti-Defamation League that they naturally hated Flynns. But what supplied another reason, according to Barnes, "for their frenzied hatred of him is his revelation of fascist trends in Roosevelt foreign policy and its political results" (*Perpetual War*, p. 50).

Accusing the Rooseveltians of fascistic trends enraged them. But these in reality more probably were communistic rather than fascistic. Certain it is that at a great cost to America they resulted in benefits, not for any fascist country, but almost exclusively, excepting perhaps Israel, for Soviet Russia.

Incontrovertibly, the sympathies of the Rooseveltians were communistic, not fascistic. If nevertheless, their policies were in fact fascistic rather than bolshevistic, then a new look at fascism is all the more certainly needed. When Herb Philbrick in 1966 returned from Germany he wrote a "News Bulletin" entitled, "Is There a Trend Toward Fascism in America?" (October, 1966). He shows that in pre-Hitler Germany there was

"a break-down in law and order;

a sharply rising crime rate; there was rioting and violence in the streets. The young goon squads which terrorized German citizens and looted stores came before Hitler — not after. And do you know what their cry was? 'Police brutality.' "

Mr. Philbrick found Germans suggesting that unless Americans find a way to curb violence and looting, their democracy would be replaced by fascism. That may be. But the instigators of this violence are hoping for communism, not fascism. Churchill wrote of Italy in 1919, "The alternative to his Mussolini's rule might well have been a Communist Italy" (*Closing the Ring*, p. 51). If democracy cannot achieve law and order, then as between fascism and bolshevism, Churchill preferred the former. Most decent Americans would probably prefer it, too, but it is not the kind of fascism the liberals can be accused of!

But some conservative political scientists find that American liberalism, despite its Red sympathies, evinces symptoms of fascism. Dr. Hans F. Sennholz, cited above, writes:

"... it is a curious fact, ascertainable by every objective observer, that American liberalism evidences numerous similarities to the manifestations of Fascism."

Particularly, "the economic policies of Fascist dictators are surprisingly similar to the economic programs of our liberal administrations."

An editorial, entitled "Red, White and Blue Fascism?" in *Commonweal* (June 29, 1969), an extreme left, self-proclaimed Catholic weekly, should clinch the contention that a new look at fascism is long overdue. It starts by praising Sinclair Lewis's novel, *It Can't Happened Here*, which "summed up perfectly the complacent attitude of Americans on the possibility of fascism in this country." Then it describes the symptoms now of this rising fascism and how it would come:

"...the American fascist leader would come to us dressed in nothing more radical than modified Ivy League, talking not about the need for more living space for American expansion but about neighborhood standards and property values..."

Guarding "neighborhood standards and property values" most of us would call fine — but *Commonweal* denounces it as fascistic!

Nor would American fascism "talk about inferior nations and races but about America's sacred duty to the world." But this same *Commonweal* in 1939-41 was most articulate about America's sacred duty to crusade in favor of Soviet Russia against fascistic Germany and Italy! Further, we read, it "would not espouse a radical program but would appeal, as Mr. Nixon did in discussing student radicalism, to the sacred national past, to 'old standards,' 'old values,' 'old precepts,'..." Again, we ask, Isn't that right? Further, writes *Commonweal*, "The American fascist leader" would come "draped in the Stars and Strips," and his public appearances would open properly with a chaplain's prayer." And worst of all, he would call for

"the preservation of the American way of life — against the Communists, the pacifists, the hippies ('too lazy to wash,' people say), radical students, black extremists, the S.D.S. ..."

Also, he would denounce "long hair on boys and short skirts on girls."

In other words, this terrifying "fascism" favors patriotism, prayer, the American way of life — it opposes Reds, hippies, radicals! We reflect: Can average citizens, less sophisticated than liberals like the editors of *Commonweal* be blamed for perhaps getting the idea that fascism is not so bad after all, possibly just what should be prescribed for the disorders and rioting? And that is precisely what *Commonweal* in "Red, White and Blue Fascists?" fears:

"No sane person in this country wants a Hitler, true enough, but the day may come when many want the law and order of an American fascist, flanked on one side by the representatives of 'patriotic' organizations and on the other by exponents of the three faiths ('the American way')."

There we have it! Those of us who want law and order are "fascists," and also those who favor patriotism and believe in old-fashioned religion! Surely, a new look at fascism is long overdue. Either the way we have been defining it is wrong, or something in our democracy is wrong! If democracy cannot establish law and order, and have public prayer, and patriotism, and suppress pornography, dope, and crime, and check subversion and communism, then, alas, what alternative to "fascism," as the liberals define it, do we who want law and order have?

REPRINTS!

"Who Is The Establishment"—Rick Norton, Fall, 1970. 10 copies, \$1.

"This Judeo-Christian Heritage Hoax"—Joseph P. Kamp, Spring, 1970. 12 copies, \$1.

Order From:

THE AMERICAN MERCURY

P. O. Box 1306 • Torrance, California 90505